



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the "pageant" of the Nine Worthies in *Love's Labour's Lost* is surely not an interlude, but rather a masquerade. P. 207, n. 4, add Brotanek, *Eng. Maskensp.*, p. 22 f., pp. 326 ff.; and Chambers, II, pp. 263 ff., pointing out that Gascoigne omits the "Coventrie." See also Strutt, pp. 162 ff. I happen to have an edition of the "Princely Pleasures" printed by John Merridew, 1825, which is not in Greg's list cited by Dr. Withington. Finally this bibliography on the Kenilworth festivities should also contain Schelling, *The Queen's Progress*, Boston and N. Y., 1904, pp. 1 ff

From the foregoing observations and suggestions the impression may easily be gained that much of importance is wanting in Dr Withington's book. But if a criticism is to be really useful it must lay more emphasis on the deficiencies than on the merits of a work, with the possibility of pointing out future lines of investigation. Criticism would err seriously in this case, however, if it failed to make clear that the defects are chiefly of a very minor character and that they are greatly outweighed by the value of the study as a whole. Pageant material is exceedingly scattered, and confused and confusing, and as a rule lacking in organization. Dr. Withington has produced order and clarity. He has rendered much that has been unknown accessible, and has made the task of him who perhaps did not wish to investigate the entire troublesome field but needed only to ascertain a few facts in their proper background light indeed. Perhaps it is because this volume is so much more than the "historical outline" which it purports to be, that we expect every possible phase of the subject to be dealt with. The fact remains that within its limits it is authoritative, besides being entertaining and readable.

HOWARD R. PATCH.

Bryn Mawr College.

The Classical Influence in English Literature in the Nineteenth Century, and Other Essays and Notes. By WILLIAM CHISLETT, JR. Boston, The Stratford Co., 1918.

Dr. Chislett has essayed an ambitious task. To trace the influence of the ancient world upon the literature of a century in one hundred and fifty pages, of which only forty-seven are specifically devoted to this purpose, is a fairly formidable design. What the

book actually furnishes, however, is chiefly a set of jottings from the author's notebooks, but slightly digested, and in many cases only remotely connected with the theme announced. The desultory character of the work is emphasized by its form of presentation. It consists, except for the introduction and conclusion, of long lists of names with a sentence of two attached to each, after the following fashion: "Jane Austen reacted against the Gothic romance, and wrote six realistic novels of the best type showing distinct traces of her knowledge of French.—Charlotte and Emily Bronte also knew French, together with a little Latin from their father. Emily's *Wuthering Heights* has been compared to Greek tragedy, but it is lacking in restraint; a quality on the other hand, which characterizes most of her exceedingly subjective poetry.—Miss Mitford is still read for her *Our Village*: among her dramas *Rienzi* was successful.—Mrs. Gaskell's books show fineness and poise, especially her *Cranford* and *Cousin Phillis*." Occasionally, it is but just to say, these compressed estimates have rather more pith in them. Christina Rossetti is summed up happily enough when we are told that she "knew Homer, temperamentally, at second hand, through her brothers and sisters and a haze of modern world-weariness. She is both finely Greek and exquisitely English, however, in her lyrical *Venus's Looking-Glass*"; and there is a rather neat epitome for Robert Louis Stevenson: "Stevenson was a realistic romanticist who appreciated Homer, caught the Greek spirit, praised Latin for its conciseness, knew Roman Law, imitated Cicero, quoted Virgil and Horace, admired Martial, and called Petronius "silly stuff."

Dr. Chislett evidently aims in his little appraisals at what he calls in the introduction "classical brevity." Unfortunately many of them are notable only for brevity, and some have hardly enough of that quality. Such tags as the following might without loss have been made even shorter: "Dora Greenwell's *Demeter and Cora* records a conversation between Demeter and Proserpine"; "Robert Stephen Hawker lived in Cornwall, where he wrote much good romantic poetry"; "Frederick Locker-Lampson wrote graceful *vers de société*." Other aphorisms are disputable: "George Russell ('A-E')'s paganism is that of earth worship"; "Lafcadio Hearn . . . died a Japanese citizen. His work has the restraint of his adopted people"; "Francis Thompson's essay *Paganism Old and New* holds that paganism with the Christian leaven in it is alone

poetical." This last statement is varied on another page to read: "Francis Thompson, in his essay on *Paganism Old and New* declares only paganism with a Christian leaven in it is true paganism." The position which Thompson upheld in this brilliant paper is neither so narrow as the first of these sentences would suggest, nor so nearly meaningless as the second. His central thought is quite clearly formulated in these words: "The poetry of Paganism is chiefly a modern creation; in the hands of the pagans themselves it was not even develop'd to its full capabilities." Finally, in not a few cases where some of a writer's works are selected for special mention, Dr. Chislett has omitted just those most conspicuously imbued with the classical spirit or reflecting classical interests: thus there is no mention under Mrs. Browning of *Aurora Leigh*, under Stephen Phillips of *Christ in Hades*, under Lawrence Binyon of *Porphyryion*, or under Bernard Shaw of *Cæsar and Cleopatra*.

Completeness is hardly to be expected in a catalog of this kind; but the method by which it seems to have been put together is favorable to omissions. This method is rather ingenuously indicated by a set of postscripts headed as follows: "The following poets are added from Arthur Symons' *The Romantic Movement in English Poetry*"; "The following additional poets, showing classical influences, are taken from Miles' *The Poets and Poetry of the Century*"; "Additional Minor Poets from F. St. John Corbett's *A History of English Poetry*, 1904." The advisability might be suggested to Dr. Chislett of increasing the number of his postscripts by the use of such standard manuals as Hugh Walker's *The Literature of the Victorian Era* or Leon Kellner's *Die englische Literatur im Zeitalter der Königin Viktoria*. These would have suggested a considerable number of rather important further additions. Thus he has failed to include William Johnson (later William Cory), the author of *Ionica*, whom Mr. Gosse has declared the greatest Hellenist of the age; Charles Mackay, whose works include the *Studies from the Antique*; Ernest Myers with his *Hellenica*; John Mason Neale, Wilfred Scawen Blunt, and Margaret L. Woods, each of whom in diverse ways drank deep from classic streams. We also miss the whole of that interesting group of humorists who have used classic mythology as material for burlesque and whose success has indicated at the same time the familiarity of the English public

with the classics and the widespread reaction against their domination: the Victorian extravaganza writers J. R. Planché, R. B. Brough, W. S. Gilbert, and F. C. Burnand; Owen Seaman, the editor of *Punch*, who has turned Horace so brilliantly to account for purposes of current comment; and Mr. Maurice Baring, whose *Dead Letters* and *Lost Diaries* treat the ancients in true Shavian fashion as contemporaries. A much more serious omission is that of almost all the great succession of classical scholars and historians: Arnold, Thirlwall, Grote, Merivale, Hodgkin, and Jowett; Mr. J. G. Frazer, Mr. Frederick Harrison, Mr. Gilbert Murray, Miss Violet Paget ("Vernon Lee"), and Miss J. E. Harrison. Possibly these were passed over as being outside the realm of pure literature,—tho how is it possible to deal with the use made of the classics by the literature of our time without taking into account the influence of a Jowett or a Frazer? And certain of the group—notably Gilbert Murray and "Vernon Lee"—have done memorable work of a purely creative sort. Among later poets, furthermore—and Dr. Chislett comes down to 1916 in some of his references—we fail to find Eugene Lee-Hamilton, among whose finely chiselled sonnets and ballads classic themes are less numerous only than those from medieval and modern Italy; Mr. John Masefield, whose historical drama *Pompey the Great* is one of his most original achievements; Mr. Charles Montagu Doughty, who has not only gone to Greek models for his epic *The Dawn in Britain* and his drama *Adam Cast Forth*, but has shaped his style and even his syntax more closely on the classical languages than perhaps any other English poet has dared to do; and Mr. Lascelles Abercrombie.

But the most important single name that Dr. Chislett has omitted is that of Mr. A. E. Housman. Professor Housman's little series of lyrics *A Shropshire Lad*, first published in 1896, is one of the few volumes of essential poetry of its generation, and one of the very few in which the genuine classic spirit—the spirit of Lucretius and the Anthology—lives again for our day. If nineteenth century Epicureanism found its final expression in the *Rubaiyat* of Fitzgerald, the soul of ancient Stoicism has as authentic and as perfect a reincarnation in the sixty-three songs of *A Shropshire Lad*. One catches echoes from its music everywhere in the work of the younger English poets, particularly those writing since 1914, who have learned from it the classical note that sounds increasingly in their

pages, as from no other intermediate source unless it be the example of Mr. Bridges.

The summaries which Dr. Chislett includes in his introduction and conclusion contain some useful generalizations; and the essays brought together in the second part of the book are distinctly less open to criticism than is Part I. They are chatty and harmless, and would find an appropriate place in those pages at the back of a "high-toned" family magazine where the editor unburdens his soul. There they might perhaps have been allowed to remain. It is well worth while, however, to reiterate the truth, too often overlooked, that the classics were far from being always classical, and that both realism and romanticism as well are abundantly present in Greek and Latin literature. It follows as a natural corollary that the modern Englishman "finds the Greek genius so complex that he can discover Puritanism, paganism, temperance, extravagance, tragedy, comedy, didacticism, emotionalism, classicism, romanticism, or realism in it as he pleases." All this is well worth repeating, as Dr. Chislett does more than once; for when all is said the last word for the genius of ancient literature is universality; and perhaps the best claim that our age can make to having duly appreciated the classics is that more than any previous century ours has done justice to their inexhaustible variety.

One of the "Notes" in Part II invites more particular comment, for it illustrates the danger of neglecting the background of current scholarship in interpreting a current poem on a classical theme. It is entitled "Additional Note on the Sources of Moody's *Thammuz*." In this curious little poem, one of the last he wrote, William Vaughn Moody departed widely from the lines of the myth of Thammuz, or Adonis, as laid down in ancient literature as well as in Shakspeare and Milton. Moody represented Thammuz as having been slain, not by the boar, but by the frenzied women who are his own worshippers, and who now proceed to mourn his fate beside the blood-stained stream for a summer's night. With the rising sun their grief departs upon the return of "radiant Thammuz, risen anew." Dr. Chislett explains this radical alteration of the story as due to a "combination" of the Thammuz-Adonis myth with the Orpheus story and the *Bacchae* of Euripides. But as a matter of fact neither of these additional sources would have given Moody the feature which is the essence of his new version, namely

the slaying of a god by his own worshippers. Besides, the method of "combination" may describe correctly the practise of a Milton, but it presupposes an attitude toward the classics foreign to his more modest or more scrupulous modern successors. The royal privilege of arbitrarily changing or blending ancient myths, formerly exercised by the poets, is now the prerogative of professors of comparative religion. For his transformation Moody had no less an authority than Mr. J. G. Frazer, whose *Attis, Adonis, and Osiris*, published in 1896, had already effected just the innovations that appear in the poem. Mr. Frazer found the detail of the boar rather inconvenient for his theory that all divinities of the Adonis type were originally identified with a consecrated human sacrifice; and he has calmly assumed, altho without a shred of positive evidence, that Adonis was primitively so slain. The other peculiar feature of Moody's version, by which the death and resurrection of the god are made to coincide with the setting and rising of the sun, was also probably suggested by Mr. Frazer's volume. In treating Osiris, whom he expressly identifies on the same page with Adonis, he says: "It may readily be admitted that the daily appearance and disappearance of the sun might very naturally be expressed by a myth of his death and resurrection," altho he inclines rather to interpret all such myths as based upon the annual growth and decay of vegetation. All these fascinating new theories had reached the crest of their popularity and authority just about the time when Moody probably wrote *Thammuz*; and his beautiful stanzas were doubtless poetical reconstructions of the scene from primitive religion imagined by Mr. Frazer. It is not the first time that a poet has gained from a scholar a fresh vision of the ancient world.

ROBERT L. RAMSAY.

University of Missouri.

España Pintoresca, The Life and Customs of Spain in Story and Legend. By CAROLINA MARCIAL DORADO. Ginn and Company, 1917. viii + 332 pp.

España Pintoresca is a remarkable *tour de force*. The author, who understands Americans as well as Spaniards, has realized that the American student in taking up Spanish reading finds himself in an atmosphere so foreign to anything with which he is familiar